



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE WORKINGS OF MODERNISM

J. R. SLATTERY

Paris, France

Rousseau is reported to have first used the word "modernists" as meaning irreligious teachers. And Pius X walks in his footsteps. "Irreligious," as signifying inimical to religion embodied in creeds, is the proper word. The papacy battles for orthodoxy, which the onslaught of modernism at least undermines if it may not sweep away entirely. The Protestant churches also are alive to the situation, e. g., the cases of Briggs, McGiffert, and Smith in Presbyterianism and Crapsey among the Episcopalians. The whole structure of orthodoxy may go down before the movement which the *Civilla cattolica* immortalized in naming it "modernism." The modernists were distinct workers in various branches, in different countries, ignorant in fact of one another's drift, but laboring for a common end, the reconciliation of church and science, and indeed out of love for that church, whose sons they claim to be. It is no wonder that Rome took alarm. The Pope describes them as members of a system. They are conspirators. But no one knew of this concerted aim till Pius X informed the world of it; just as no one recognized Americanism till Leo XIII branded it in his letter *Testem benevolentiae*. Or again, as under the ancient régime when the Papacy stamped Jansenism as the scourge of the church's children. The shibboleth—modernism—is fastened upon men, Catholics and loyal to the church, of whom every one when condemned recognized the authority that smote him, save the handful of Italians who wrote *Il programma dei modernisti*. These alone, countrymen of the Pope, brought casuistry worthy of the Jesuits into play to prove that even if banned they are still untouched and may exercise their priestly functions, all excommunications to the contrary notwithstanding.

The encyclical itself, however, is but one of several documents, all of which rehearse its teachings, e. g., papal letter to the bishops of Italy; syllabus of Pius X; the Pope's speech to the new cardinals, April 17, 1907; letter of the Jesuit cardinal Steinhuber, prefect of the Index, to Cardinal Ferrara of Milan, April 29, 1907, condemning

Il rinnovamento; letter of the Pope to the same condemning Bishop Bonomelli's pastoral on church and state; and so on. Now the encyclical seems first of all a new monkish quarrel registered in a pontifical document. It is a victory of the Jesuits, aided by the Franciscans, over the Dominicans. Of its writers, the Jesuit Billot and the two Franciscans, Langoyne, a Frenchman, and Marrani, an Italian, wrote the dogmatic part, while the historic is credited to Mgr. Benigni, an unknown nobody, who suddenly jumped into the limelight as editor of *Correspondenza romana*, the organ of Cardinal Dal Val. Benigni's veracity is so far questioned that if his paper makes a statement, the journals of Paris accept at once its contradictory as true.

But the letter on modernism is a great deal more. It is a defense of orthodoxy. It is the formal declaration of war against modern science, not indeed *quâ* science, but in all its methods and aims. It strikes a heresy within the church. Its blow levels the church's sons.

The Catholic church may be looked upon as a state—*un état postiche*, an irreverent Frenchman would explain—or as a society or whatever else we please. She is surely a living witness to her own identity. No doubt she has the right to say what she is, what are her parts, what is her constitution, who are her members. Such claims are inherent. Therefore when the Catholic church by her official mouthpiece—the Pope or his cabinet, the Roman congregations—declares that the doctrine known as modernism is not hers, and adds that its followers are traitors to her cause, we must accept her decision. No court of appeals exists to which we can go. Nor is there any appeal from the Pope to a council, although a future pope may ignore or forget the events of 1907.

We must not forget that Pius X has only drawn the conclusions which follow logically from the official teaching of the church and that, if his principles be true, they who accept them have not even the right to criticize the opportunity of the pontifical act. For *modernism*—such as really exists and which is neither *agnosticism* nor the philosophy of *immanence*—I say, *modernism* questions those principles, viz.: the mythological idea of external revelation, the absolute value of traditional dogma, the absolute authority of the church. So that the encyclical of Pius X was called forth by the circumstances; and Leo XIII would not have made one sensibly different, at least in essence and in the theoretical part.¹

¹ Loisy, *Simplex reflexions*, p. 275.

The many extracts from the encyclicals of Leo XIII, which Pius X quoted in his own against modernism is a proof of Doellinger's historical axiom: it is not always the same pope, but it is ever the same papacy.

Again the modernists prove completely that their case is falsely presented. This falsity is no relief to them, no bar to papal action. The Supreme Court of the United States may give a wrong judgment, there seems to be no relief. The matter may be reopened in one way or another; the Supreme Court however may uphold the old decision. The wronged citizen must either submit or expatriate himself. If there be another alternative in the state, there is certainly none in the church. To the credit of these men, Pius X, in the very document under discussion, bears high witness to their personal characters and virtues:

They lead a life of the greatest activity, of assiduous and ardent application to every branch of learning and they possess, as a rule, a reputation for the strictest morality.²

Now the papal document is lengthy. Its general import has been given in the press of the world. It is, however, important that we get some idea of its drift:

To proceed in an orderly manner in this recondite subject, it must first of all be noted that every modernist sustains and comprises within himself many personalities: he is a philosopher, a believer, a theologian, a historian, a critic, an apologist, a reformer.³

To grasp what then is meant by modernism, let the reader conjure up before his mind what he regards as needful to the make-up of those varied scholarships. Everything that, as he fancies, enters into his conception of a philosopher, a believer, and the rest, is denied and rejected by the papal encyclical.

Or again, instead of such conceptions, let the reader figure to himself some individual scholar, e. g., Huxley or James or Spencer as a philosopher; Channing or Francis Newman or Peabody as a believer; Edwards or Fairbairn as a theologian, Harnack as a historian, Renan as a critic, Aug. Sabatier as an apologist; Calvin or Luther as a reformer. Then let him form a mental photograph of them all. This picture is only a blurring of what the encyclical

² *Encyclical.*

³ *Ibid.*

Pascendi gregis acknowledges. Perhaps it is well here to remind the reader how the acquaintance is made of such writers. An excerpt is taken from a work now of one, again of another. It is given as the major of an objection to some proposition of philosophy or theology: a distinguishing minor is to hand and the ready conclusion follows that the writing is wrong. That any of the men who composed the syllabus or the letter on modernism read the great authors of the day, no one believes. The handy church textbooks suffice.

Or, again, let us take the view of leading anti-modernists. Calvalanti, one of the strongest writers on the papal side, declares that one must learn the religious, social, political alphabet not only from Billot, S.J., Pavissich, S.J., Cereseto of the Oratory, and a number of other preachers, but from the bishops themselves and the Pope. He warns his readers against the reprobated books of Loisy, Houtin, Laberthonnière, Rosmini, Harnack, Marx, Kant (*I veicoli del modernismo in Italia*, p. 14, 15). Later on (p. 87) he sums up the whole question in a sentence: *Con Roma e per Roma sempre*, "Right or wrong, Rome is right." And once more he gives a second list: Fogazzaro, Murri, Scotti, Sabatier, Tolstoi, Harnack (p. 118).

Il rinnovamento, the modernist review of Milan, puts the case thus: *O tutto o niente*—"All or nothing." Still another picture is offered by the Dominican friar Maumus, a former liberal of the school of Gratry and Lacordaire.

The foundation of scholasticism is nothing else than the whole of theological science, decrees, dogmas, knowledge of the Fathers, the pure spirit of tradition. To this science, the scholastics applied a clear, precise, severe method, which advances by propositions connected one with another by solid liens, excluding every vague or badly defined term and building up its affirmations upon irrefutable proofs.⁴

Hence, according to these Catholic authorities, the antidote of modernism lies in Rome, the episcopate, and scholasticism. To look beyond any one of them is to be a modernist. Therefore the reader's mind must be emptied of everything whatsoever that this curious medley does not include. This declaration, too, in the presence of the great results of modern scholarship!

With such a kaleidoscope before him, the reader will have a better idea of what the encyclical aims at than he could get from an analysis

⁴ *Les modernistes*, Paris, 1909, p. 171.

of its ponderous platitudes resonant with the air of mediaevalism, as Tyrrell christened the ultramontane position in his answer to the attack of Cardinal Mercier, of Mechlin.

Furthermore, a fact which must never be overlooked in papal documents is that they are also Italian. When an Italian says, *Credo in Deum*, his god is Imperial Rome, Italy united, and the papacy. Behold his trinity!

True philosophy at first and later on that of Christianity born ever in Italy is thence diffused into other countries where step by step it becomes corrupted. . . . Italy twice lost its supremacy. First when the northern barbarians wrecked the Roman Empire, and again when other barbarians annihilated the civil dictatorship of the Roman Pontificate. Twice political and intellectual anarchy stole in upon Italian domination and invaded Europe, substituting for the peaceful reign of human and divine reason a state of war between people and doctrines.⁵

In this year of grace Murri, modernist as he is, repeats the same sentiments in the January number of his review *Rivista di cultura*, once more resurrected, despite papal censures affecting, however, solely the diocese of Rome. We give a few extracts: "Il cattolicesimo e una grande creazione latina di organizzazione e di cultura" (p. 2). Again he speaks of Leo XIII as justifying "La sincerita della sua vasta visione di grandezza romana" (p. 8); "La grande tradizione latina di un governo cattolico" (p. 15).

Papal documents are the charters and by-laws of a theocracy. Through them rings a note of religion. The Holy Spirit, Jesus Christ, the blessed apostles, Peter and Paul, the eternal happiness of souls, and so on are the chords upon which, under the stroke of the Fisherman's ring, is dinned ever the same theocratical slogan. And it is just this very political aspect which Rome labors to keep hidden from the English, and especially from the American, world. Englishmen need not be blinded as they are in close union with Rome in ruling Canada, Ireland, Malta, and the Portugese churches of India. But Englishmen wilfully close their eyes, for as a branch of Christendom, they regard the church and state pretty much from the Roman standpoint. This is why in the writings that come to us from Oxford and Cambridge are discussed "The historic episcopate; the English church as a portion of the holy Catholic church; The church as the

⁵ Gioberti, *Del primato morale et civile degli italiani*, Brussels, 1845, *passim*.

national church; The Establishment; The powers and rights of the state; The mischiefs of disendowment and disestablishment."⁶

America is learning the same lesson. It found a good school in the friars of the Philippines and the church property in Cuba. The commission sent to Rome with Mr. Taft at its head, dealt with a state. There was no question of souls but of property. Give and take, demand and refuse, back out and insist, filled the minds on both sides. So also the same is evident from the rumors which were afloat during Satolli's residence at Washington to the effect that he desired, or even may have taken steps toward being an envoy plenipotentiary to the United States government of the South American republics.

Now the letter on modernism is a political document. The results of higher criticism had cut the ground from underneath papal pretensions. If scholarship be admitted Rome's supremacy is gone—a supremacy in papal eyes of the church over the state, the mistress over the handmaid. There was nothing else to do to save this supremacy but to repudiate modernism and modernists, root and branch.

The remedy should fit the disease. But yet, on turning to the papal letter and its remedies against modernism, we ask ourselves if the encyclical really hopes to work out its aim and help stumbling humanity.

That the proximate and immediate cause consists in a perversion of mind. The remote causes seem to us to be reduced to two: curiosity and pride. . . . Pride sits in modernism as in its own house. . . . Hence, venerable brethren [the bishops] it will be your first duty to thwart such proud men, to employ them only in the lowest and obscurest offices: the higher they try to rise, the lower let them be placed.⁷

What a peevish remedy to be given in the document among the causes! The great panacea is scholastic philosophy. Study St. Thomas; what matters it if all his arguments taken from astrology—fundamental though they be—have to be swept aside, or if his sacramental system and his plea for papal primacy rest upon forgeries, which his Dominican brethren in Asia Minor concocted. In spite of all scholasticism stands perfect.

⁶ Heads of a letter to his rural deans, *Letters of Bishop Stubbs*, p. 258.

⁷ "Encyclical," *Tablet Loudon*, September 28, 1907, p. 511.

Still another remedy:

The rules laid down in 1896 by the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars for the clerics both secular and regular of Italy concerning the frequenting of the universities we now deem to be extended to all nations. Clerics and priests inscribed in a Catholic institute or university, must not in the future follow in civil universities those courses for which there are chairs in the Catholic institutes to which they belong.⁸

As the chairs for clerics are limited, this remedy amounts to very little. Already Mgr. Baudrillart, president of the Catholic Institute of Paris has asked and received permission for its students to attend lectures at the Sorbonne, of course *salvâ fide et moribus*. A familiar sight even today is the *soutane* moving in and about the corridors of that great school.

Just how these young aspirants for the sanctuary are trained intellectually in church schools is well brought out in a serial now appearing in *The Irish Nation*, of Dublin. The speaker is an ex-Maynooth seminarian.

"If one could be stereotyped as Maynooth with its mighty system wants one to be—"

"You must not be disrespectful to Maynooth," said Maeve severely.

"I have no desire to be so. I have a certain affection for it, and I think with respectful awe of its tremendous schemes of milling and moulding, in which all types are fashioned into the one type, all minds regulated as one mind, cast-ironed as the mind of the Middle Ages. Year by year Maynooth calls in her conscripts, and trains them up to her grand-army standard, and when they are trained she sends them forth to post and outpost, to hold and regulate the body and soul of an untrained and submissive nation. And the marvel is how her grand army believes that it can do the work of heaven and England at the same time."⁹

In spite of this milling and moulding, the story of this ex-student shows how difficult it is to keep out the new thoughts. He got acquainted with "Darwin, Spinoza, Loisy." Some time ago we heard a Catholic bishop read a letter written before the Revolution of 1789, by a Parisian journalist to the provincial of the Capuchins at Toulouse. He bids him if he wishes to keep the novelties of that time out of the cloister to cut open the mattresses of the young friars; for he would be sure to find hidden therein Diderot and Voltaire.

Furthermore there is an almost universal literary effort, which

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 513.

⁹ *The Irish Nation*, Dublin, January 9, 1909, p. 2.

receives little attention at universities and is ignored altogether in seminaries as well as in the encyclical *Pascendi gregis*. It is the modern novel. To our own knowledge seminarians love to read it. Some six or seven years ago we called upon a teacher of the graduating class in an ultra-fashionable convent school. She told us, "I never make my confession during the annual retreat," i. e., during the week set apart for retirement, devotions, and prayer. "How long has that been going on?" was our question. "Four or five years," was the reply. "Why did you stop?" "Oh, the last time I went to confession, the Jesuit (by whom the retreat is always conducted) asked me: 'Do you read novels?' 'Yes,' I answered, 'Don't you?' The Jesuit was silent."

When from novels we pass to magazines and the daily press in which are discussed, in a loose and haphazard manner for the most part, the questions attacked in the letter on modernism, it is clear enough that the bishops will be unable to stem the tide. Above all is this true of the stage. The bishop is not a recognized play-censor.

As to three remedies: episcopal vigilance over publications and the sale of condemned books by Catholic book-dealers; censorship of books; and congresses, limited in number and scope, the uselessness of such remedies is seen at a glance.

Next the Pope orders as a remedy the creation of a spy system, "diocesan watch committees."

This remedy met an unexpected rebuff. The German bishops in session at Cologne, December, 1907, under the presidency of Cardinals Fischer and Kopp, refused point blank to promulgate the encyclical in Germany until this remedy was stricken out. And out it went for Germany. Rome wants no trouble with Prussian Germany. And it is good canon law, we believe, to regard this suppression as valid everywhere. *Favorabilia amplianda* is the canonical maxim. Spies are familiar enough in Catholic lands. In France they generally are pious women who are known as "guardian angels." But they represent a species of jesuitry, thoroughly distasteful to the nobler element of Catholics.

It is, however, in the last remedy that we see how cheap is the whole measure of repression:

It is our intention to establish and develop by every means in our power a special institute in which through the co-operation of those Catholics who are most eminent for their learning, the progress of science and other realms of knowledge may be promoted under the guidance and teaching of Catholic truth.¹⁰

No place and no time was assigned for this new institute. For two years there was no sign of its starting. Early in June, 1909, however, there was promulgated the apostolic letter, *Vinea electa sacrae Scripturae*, dated May 7, 1909, by which a higher pontifical school of biblical study is created. It is put in charge of the Jesuits and will be a branch of their university, known as the Gregorian. The rector will be chosen by the Pope from three Jesuits, whose names their general will submit to the Holy Father. The former also names the professors, subject to the Holy See's approval; next he will choose extra teachers who may become members of the regular staff. A feature of the proposed institute will be close and steady contact between the professors and the students. To be matriculated, the candidate must have made the courses in philosophy and theology and have gained his D.D. By this provision, lay youths are excluded. The library, created also by the letter, will be opened to outsiders by special permission. For the time being, the Jesuits will house the new institute in their Gregorian University, where during the present scholastic year a new course in Sacred Scripture has been in vogue under Fathers Fonck and Méchineau. The latter lost his health, thus leaving the former alone, who now stands a fair chance of being named first rector of the proposed institute. Fonck was formerly professor at Innsprück and, like the present general of the Jesuits, is neither Italian nor Spanish nor French nor English nor American. In inner clerical circles, this institute will doubtless be looked upon as a fresh victory of the Jesuits over their eternal enemies, the Dominicans, whose school of biblical studies at Jerusalem will now take second place. Scholars, however, the world over, should welcome this new departure inasmuch as its avowed purpose is to be "a remedy to the biblical theories of modernism." Here at last is a center of biblical scholarship, whence should emanate an intelligent appreciation of exactly what the Catholic church holds

¹⁰ The *Tablet*, *loc. cit.*,

in regard to the Bible, and how she proposes to stem the avalanche of biblical criticism that is within the church herself. But after all the new "Pontifical Biblical Institute," as it is called, is not the institute promised in the encyclical against modernism. It is merely the fulfilment of an idea of Leo XIII, which Pius X endorsed in his own letter, *Scripturae sanctae*, February 23, 1904, i. e., three years before the letter on modernism.

In a word, the encyclical emphasizes the fact that the movements of mankind are *hors de Rome*. She has lost, and lost forever, her once universal hold on the state, the family, the university, the school, and the workshop. Her face is toward the setting sun, and humanity faces ever the morning. She will die hard. Chiefly for the reasons given by Ihring in his *Spirit of Roman Law*. The learned scholar of Goettingen holds that the nations of Europe drew their law, their Christianity, their civilization, from Rome. These very reasons explain in great measure her hold. Our laws are Roman and "the papacy is the ghost of Caesar sitting on the ashes of the Roman Empire." Christianity came not indeed from Rome, but rather from the strong arm of the secular power; but the fact stands that Christendom accepts Rome as the source of its religion: so too our civilization is Roman, if not of origin, at least of adaptation. Bear well in mind that the old Romans followed the river ways in extending their empire. The Rhine, the Rhone, the Arno, and the Danube were their highways. In the countries washed by them, Roman culture flourished, which Catholicism inherited. The great exception, in Europe, of a country not under Roman domination, that remained Catholic, is Ireland. Probably the reason is that the Irish missionaries to Roman Europe, first Arian and Pelagian, gradually underwent the fascination of the imperial idea, till it was transplanted a rare exotic into Ireland, to take root, flourish, and finally crush out Irish nationality. Time and time again we read of fossils of prehistoric days being found, which, buried away for ages, still retain enough of their originals to serve as working hypotheses for the savant. In a similar way the old frameworks—law, civilization, Christianity—serve to keep Rome before the eyes of the world. Men put life where there is none. *Fili hominis, putasne ista ossa vivent?* Rome knows full well that she is at least moribund. But she ever

looks for that resurrection which seemed in sight under scholasticism, got its first set-back in the Renaissance, its defeat in the Reformation, and its divorce from the state in the American Revolution.

Yes, for the Roman church it is a question of life or death. The claims which Gregory VII has so strongly laid down, Innocent III so masterfully uplifted, Boniface VIII so clearly put forth in *Unam sanctam*, were and are universal. When Henry IV went to Canossa, and Philip the Fair sent his agent to Anagni, both Gregory and Boniface in a measure won, but in a larger measure lost. For from them—the first, chiefly—according to Lord Acton, sprang that movement of the masses which is still progressing and winning.

Let us now briefly study the effects of the bull on modernism throughout Europe and America. As already noted, it met its first defeat in Germany and its first exception in France. Shortly before the appearance of the syllabus, the church world was amazed to learn that there was a conspiracy among Germans against the Index. The *Correspondenza romana*, but then six weeks old, first announced this conspiracy. It was clear that the new journal had inside information. The innermost archives of the Vatican had been opened to it. Names of prominent German Catholics were given as members of this league, and documents reproduced with misleading comments. While it may be called a conspiracy inasmuch as it ignored the clergy, the episcopate, the Roman congregations, and appealed immediately to the Pope, still it was in fact a concerted public movement which the Germans attempted.

At the same time, the case of Schell of Würzburg was brought up. Schell had gone to his grave and his admirers determined to put up a monument over his tomb. Rome condemned this act and charged the subscribers as “heretics and ignoramuses,” among whom were the archbishop of Bamberg, the bishop of Passau, Professor Funk of Tübingen, Baron von Hügel, and other notable Germans. Schell had been professor of dogmatic theology in the Catholic faculty of the University of Würzburg. Four of his works had been put on the Index. Sometime ago the *Augsburger Abend-Zeitung* published a number of letters from Schell who denied in them that he ever signed the retraction and charged his bishop, Schloer of Würzburg, with having signed it.

Following on this came an article in the *Internationale Wochenschrift* by Ehrhard, professor of church history at Strasburg. It was not the first time that Ehrhard ran afoul of Rome. While professor at Vienna he wrote a severe criticism of papal politics and followed it up by an answer to his critics worse if anything than his first effort. Vienna and Austria became too small for him, but the Emperor William named him to the same chair at Strasburg. He christened the anti-modernist movement as a *Kulturkampf* in the very bosom of the Catholic church.

Following Strasburg, came Munich. Dr. Schnitzer, professor of dogma in the University of Munich, in the same journal, only two weeks or so later, repeated and amplified the position of Ehrhard.

The condemnation of modernism could only cause surprise in circles where people do not or will not know the Roman Curia. Not only optimistic Catholics of the stamp of Schell, but many Protestants also love to depict an ideal Rome, entrusted with a sublime mission of higher culture, an incomparable shelter of thought and Christian life and brotherly love. They extol her enthusiastically. Then all at once, they run up against the Rome of the encyclical and are profoundly miserable at finding her so different from the Rome they have dreamt of in their lonely studies.¹¹

Ehrhard was in Prussian territory, Schnitzer in Bavarian. Pius X dared not hit the former; but he departed from all canonical forms by suspending the Bavarian over the head of the archbishop of Munich.

Then the professors of Munich met and petitioned the government to abolish the faculty of theology. Schnitzer was made titular professor. But even here papal hate followed him, and now, although holding his chair, he has a sabbatical year *ad libitum*. In March, 1909, Schnitzer came out in defense of the modernists in the supplement of the *Münchener Neuesten Nachrichten*. At once the nuncio demanded a formal retraction under penalty of being excommunicated by name. This threat has not as yet been carried out.

The modernist movement with its traces of Doellingerism in Bavaria led to an unusual departure on Rome's part. The Italian nuncio was found to be so grossly incompetent that Rome named in his place a German Benedictine monk, Frühwiller.

¹¹ Quoted by Sabatier, *Modernism*, Jowett Lecture of 1908, p. 107.

Next in Austrian territory came Wahrmond, professor of canon law at Innsbrück. In answer to the encyclical on modernism, he published a pamphlet *Katholische Weltanschauung und Freie Wissenschaft* and in April, 1908, *Ultramontan*. The former is a spirited defense of the freedom of science and the latter a strong attack on ultramontane morals and practices which ends with a list of the relics of the Scala Sancta and the Lateran basilica in Rome as also of the Benedictine monastery of Charroux, France. He lost his chair at Innsbrück and was transferred to Prague.¹² Last of all, the modernist review of Munich, *Das Zwanzigste Jahrhundert* has been suppressed.

France, however, has been the storm center, as it always is in Roman matters. In fact, the Frenchmen that are on the Index outnumber those from all the rest of mankind put together. In modernism it is the same. Of the 65 propositions which make up the syllabus of Pius X, about fifty are taken from the writings of Loisy and the encyclical shows about the same proportion.

With Loisy's writings before them, the authors of the syllabus in every single instance quoted the learned scholar wrongly. *Not once are they correct*. Surely Loisy has given abundant matter for condemnation. But why the men who sat in judgment upon him had to twist, turn, and alter his writings is beyond understanding.

To notice all the French writers condemned would demand a volume. "Loisy, Laberthonnière, Le Roy, Dupin, and Saintyves (both noms-de-plume), Houtin, Bonnefoy, Denis, Viollet, professor of the Sorbonne, Lefrance (pseudonym), Dimnet, and La Morin. Nearly all Catholic advanced journals have had to shut off their printing presses: *Quinzaine*, *Demain*, *Justice sociale*, *Vie catholique*, *Democratie chrétienne*, *La revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses*, *Revue catholique des églises*, and more. The last named died impenitent, for it welcomed the French translation of Tyrrell's "Letter to a Professor of Anthropology." Battifol was hunted from the presidency of the Catholic Institute of Toulouse, while the Abbé Klein, well known to Americans, was deprived of his chair at the Catholic Institute of Paris and retired as *un professeur honoraire*.

¹² The history of the Wahrmond incident was given in the *Journal of Theology*, April, 1909, pp. 238 ff.

The storm in France as far as the literary world goes, has about subsided, save that the unique sight of a bishop—La Croix—who is professor at the Sorbonne keeps the clericals chafing. The main troubles now are royalist outbursts around the Sorbonne and a bitter fight against the public school—*le terreur noir*—in the provinces, especially in Anjou, Normandy, and Brittany. The lectures at the College of France by Loisy, recently named professor there, were attended by no disturbances.

In England the ex-Jesuit Tyrrell was most conspicuous until his death. Cardinal Mercier, of Mechlin, so far forgot himself and his limitations as to attack Tyrrell in his pastoral letter for the Lent of 1908. We may all thank His Eminence for his slip as he proved the occasion of probably the most readable of Tyrrell's books and certainly the best handbook on the whole question.¹³

¹³ George Tyrrell, *Mediaevalism: A Reply to Cardinal Mercier* (Longmans). Father George Tyrrell died July 15, 1909, aged forty-eight, at Storrington, Sussex, England. He was an Irishman by birth and a cousin of Professor Tyrrell of Trinity College, Dublin, whose edition of Cicero's correspondence with learned essays in six volumes is well known to the scholarly world. At eighteen George became a Catholic and a year later joined the Jesuits. He was the author of many works, full of thought, but, to the writer at least, very hard to read. In his last work—*Reply to Cardinal Mercier of Mechlin*—Tyrrell declared that he got his first doubts from his meditations upon the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius Loyola—a fresh confirmation of the saying of Orestes Brownson that the Jesuits are the fathers of rationalism. It was his "Letter to a Professor of Anthropology." This professor holds a chair in a continental university. In his doubts he turned to Tyrrell at the suggestion, so it seems, of Cardinal Mercier. Hence the above-mentioned pastoral letter, which got Tyrrell into hot water. A translation, made, we believe, by Fogazzaro, senator of Italy, was published in a garbled fashion by *Il Corriere della Sera* of Milan, and brought the subject home to the Jesuit authorities. Several letters passed between the Jesuit General and Tyrrell. The upshot was his expulsion, in consequence of which he was *ipso facto* suspended *a divinis*. This suspension following on dismissal is one of the peculiar privileges of the Jesuits who are "clerks regular," and unknown to the monks and friars. To have the suspension lifted, Tyrrell would be obliged to submit even his private correspondence to the competent authority, viz., Cardinal Ferrara of Milan. Of course Tyrrell would not suffer such a degradation. So things jogged along during the past couple of years.

Stricken with a fatal illness while the guest of Miss Petre, several friends came to his bedside, among whom were Baron Von Hügel and the ex-Jesuit, Henri Bremond, of Neuilly, Paris. Tyrrell wished to die a Catholic and to receive the last rites of the church but refused to retract any of his writings and teachings. He received the last sacraments but was denied Christian burial by the Bishop of Southwark, acting under the advice of Archbishop Bourne of Westminster. The whole story of his death was

Tyrrell's own native Ireland is beginning to feel the modernist movement. The *Irish Nation*, a weekly of Dublin, is thoroughly up on the matter. While expressing the utmost loyalty to Rome, its pages are open to discussions which must make the Irish hierarchy stagger.

In Italy, however, the ferment is at fever heat. Curiously the storm in northern Italy centers round Tyrrell, and in Rome around Dom. Murri. *Il rinnovamento* of Milan is ever holding up the teaching of Tyrrell. In its January number, 1909, he published a paper: "Are the Churches Necessary?" He argues not for *a* church, or *the* church, but for churches with no special set of doctrines.

From Italy came *What We Ask* and *The Programme of the Modernists*. Both books are saucy and wanting in the respect which the age and office of the Pope demand. But they are incisive and no doubt widely read in the Peninsula. They have been translated into French and English. Dom. Murri, who seems a living thorn in the Pope's side, has once more resurrected his magazine. The Piedmontese party alleges a split in the movement in Italy, claiming that *Il rinnovamento* stands for the genuine modernist while *Nova et vetera*, now defunct, pleaded for a socialistic Catholicism or a Catholic socialism with Murri at its head. It explains the split thus:

Our modernism was and remains a criticism of Catholicism, or, to put it better, of certain concrete and relatively new phases which Catholicism has taken on: a criticism, however, inspired by faith in a greater Catholicism, by an ardent love of Christianity. Whereas the new modernism is a true and peculiar criticism of Christianity, intending by this word the religion of Jesus, or such as it is become in the various Christian churches.¹⁴

Here then is something new in Italian history, a distinction between Catholicism and Christianity. Curious line of cleavage! The new modernists—Murri and his school—in identifying Christianity with socialism laicize the former. In spite of this *Il rinnovamento* speaks of *La nostra civiltà e la nostra religione*.

sent to the *Times* of London (July 16) by Miss Petre and to *Il Giornale dell' Italia* of Rome (July 26) by Baron Von Hügel. Tyrrell died like a man, with his flag nailed to the mast.

¹⁴ January, 1909, p. 410.

In criticizing *Lettere di un prete modernista*, perhaps the latest essay on the matter, the Milan review declares that this priest might have dedicated his letters to the Jesuit Billot.

As far as we are concerned we would not be surprised if like himself they came forth from the Gregorian (i. e. the Jesuit) University.¹⁵

The hand is the hand of Esau, but the pen is that of Jacob. As in France Loisy in a rostrum of the College of France stands victorious, so on Monte Citorio Murri as a deputy is also a victor. He was excommunicated as *vitandus*, but in spite of it was elected to the Italian Parliament at the election of 1909 by the town of Monte Georgio—a former papal possession.

On turning, however, to America, we find a church that may be called modern from its cradle. The American Republic, which startled the world by the very fact of its existence, amazed men by excluding the church from its usual status in other governments, viz.: a constitutional or a legal feature. True, the state in her relations with the church, once the latter has accepted its legal civil status from the state, always deals with the church according to the latter's own laws and statutes, yet it is state officials who judge. Even today the relation of the United States to the church is so modern that France alone in Europe has accepted it. The Revolution of 1789 made the church part of itself in the civil constitution of the clergy, and when in 1871 Gambetta declared clericalism the enemy of France, loyal to his Italian blood he never thought of abolishing the Concordat.

Little commotion has the encyclical caused in America. We doubt, too, if the triennial sworn reports on modernistic infection of the hundred and odd American prelates will ever cross the Atlantic. The letter of Leo XIII on Americanism raised a tempest in a teapot and led to the condemnation of Elliott's *Life of Hecker*, but is long since forgotten. The year previous the book of Rev. George Zurcher, of Buffalo, on *Monks and Their Doctrines*, went on the Index, but his far more serious book, *The Apple of Discord*, which is the papacy itself, published anonymously, has thus far escaped.

When, however, the storm occasioned by the encyclical and syllabus was lulling and dying out in Europe, it suddenly crossed the Atlantic

¹⁵ January, 1909, p. 409.

and in a spent, fitful way reached America, hitting Chicago and Rochester. The *American Journal of Theology* is the first American review to be honored with a Roman disapprobation. In its issue of January, 1906, i. e., a year and a half before the syllabus of Pius X, Dr. Hanna of Rochester wrote on "Some Recent Books on Catholic Theology." He did not indeed receive the big stick; he merely lost the mitre. But his criticism and an article of his in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* on "Absolutism" are at least *piarum aurium offensiva*. And Dr. Hanna was denounced to Rome by a brother professor only when his name headed the *terna*, sent to the Holy See from which to select a coadjutor to the archbishop of San Francisco.

Kübel, in his valuable *Geschichte des Modernismus*, gives only a few lines to the United States. He quotes Ehrhart of Strasburg to the effect that there is hardly a trace of intellectual activity in the Catholic church of America. The chief response to the papal document is a pastoral letter of Archbishop O'Connell, of Boston, which totally brushes aside the points at issue and is mere rhetoric. The Catholic University sent a formal letter of adhesion, as did, so we are told, Cardinal Gibbons in the name of the hierarchy. In the New York Cathedral, an Advent course of sermons was preached against modernism. They afterward appeared in *The Catholic World*, of New York.

A professor at Dunwoodie—the seminary of New York—translated a French *Catechism of Modernism*, while the editors of the *New York Review*, published at the same seminary, quietly suppressed that monthly. Dr. Hanna had scorched it also with his heated pen-point. At the Catholic Summer School, Plattsburg, N. Y., three courses of lectures on modernism were given. In several dioceses the spy board was created. New York has its spies, but their names have not been published. So has Newark, where, we believe, the names were given out. The New York spies, however, have made a hit. During the midsummer vacation of this year, the very Reverend Dr. Driscoll was removed from the rectorship of this diocesan seminary at Dunwoodie on direct orders from Rome. He was charged with being in touch with a censured priest. This able scholar, a much-beloved pupil of Loisy, is now in charge of an obscure parish. In an article in *The Ecclesiastical Review* (February,

1909) Dr. Turner of the Catholic University, Washington, charges the modernists with being enemies of reason, and claims that mediaevalism and neo-scholasticism are buttressed by reason. Loisy, Hébert, Houtin, Fogazzaro, and the whole school of modernists must sit up, take notice, and rub their eyes in wonder. It took an American theologian to discover that they discard reason. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that among the many qualities distinctly applied to every modernist by the encyclical, such as philosopher, believer, etc., the charge of being a rationalist is overlooked. Not that the Roman compilers thought him non-rational, but because rationalism is the very basis of his studies and conclusions. Or did Rome omit "rationalist" just to give a text to writers like Dr. Turner? An advanced scholar among the Catholic clergymen of America is bringing out a book on the subject. Friends who have read it assure us that it is forcible and logical, covering the whole question of modernism and the American church. Not long ago this author, who was a Paulist, left the church and with him a second Paulist left.

Where, we may ask, are the great leaders of liberalism in the American church? The men who crushed Cahenslyism, brought the apostolic delegation to Washington, restored McGlynn, introduced American church ideas to Europe, e. g., O'Connell at Freiburg and Ireland at Paris and Orleans? They seem to have entered the lowly tomb of Brownson at South Bend, Ind., or of Hecker under St. Paul's fane in New York. For they are as silent as those two dead champions of the American church. Liberalism, it seems, died in the American church when Spalding of Peoria was paralyzed, and Fitzgerald of Little Rock, who voted against papal infallibility, died.

The attack on Dr. Hanna occurs in probably one of the best statements of the church's position in regard to modernism and all that it implies. They are two studies which appeared in the *Analecta Ecclesiastica* (May and July, 1908) by Rev. Alexius M. Lepicier, of the Servites, and professor of dogmatic theology at the Propaganda.

Lepicier states the whole antique position. How weak it is, appears from an admission of his own. He refers to the danger of

a *circulus vitiosus* in explaining how revelation is received on the authority of the church and the church herself as offered to us by revelation, but he appends a footnote in which he declares that the defense of revelation does not properly belong to theology strictly speaking, but to metaphysics. We give the Latin text of this extraordinary teaching of an anti-modernist and a propaganda professor:

Quapropter, quaestio de existentia revelationis non ad theologiam proprie dictam, sed ad metaphysicam proprie pertinet.¹⁶

But, if revelation is a metaphysical question and not a theological, the Catholic church begins in metaphysics, i. e., she has a philosophical foundation. Perhaps that is not a bad way to look at her, viz., as a system of philosophy. Give her place then as such. Let her stand or fall with the other philosophies.

Professor Foster seems much more orthodox than Lepicier, curial and religious as the latter is.

The question is whether this connection between Christianity and *special* divine revelation is not absolutely essential, that Christianity cannot be maintained without this connection. And the answer is that specific appreciation of Christ as revelation and the peculiarity of the Christian religion belong together, stand and fall together. Rob revelation of its supernatural character and it becomes stale, flat, and unprofitable. Christianity is the religion of a special revelation of God—that or nothing.¹⁷

In fact, Lepicier is much more in accord with Loisy:

The fruitful truths of the religious order, those which make up from the standpoint of theology, the substance of revelation, are formed by the union of ideas or images which antedate such truths in the minds of those who first conceived them. What made the beginning of revelation at a given moment, was the grasping, no matter how rudimentary, the relation which should exist between man, conscious of himself, and God, behind the visible world. The development of revealed religion was brought about by the perception of new relations or rather by a more exact and more distinct classifying of the essential relation, foreseen from the beginning, man thus learning to know better and better both God's greatness and the nature of his own duty.¹⁸

Lastly we may ask: What is the theological value of the syllabus and the encyclical on modernism?

¹⁶ *Analecta Ecclesiastica*, May, 1908, p. 209, n. 1.

¹⁷ *The Finality of the Christian Religion*, p. 47.

¹⁸ *Autour d'un petit livre*, p. 196.

In promulgating his syllabus, Pius X was prudent enough to omit applying any censure to any of its propositions. In the syllabus of 1864, to the several propositions Pius IX appended censures, viz., heretical, near to heresy, scandalous, offensive to pious ears, etc.

There are no such censures in the syllabus of 1907. The world at large christened it "The Syllabus of Pius X."

The propositions are "condemned and prescribed as they are by this general decree (viz., syllabus) condemned and prescribed."

Again, the encyclical on modernism (*Pascendi gregis*) attaches no theological censure. True, the Pope calls the modernists names and rather wantonly insults them, but these may or may not be outbursts of temper; they certainly are not censures.

What then is the theological value of the syllabus and the letter on modernism? They have no theological value. This is not merely our view, but the teaching of the Jesuit Billot, one of the writers of the encyclical on modernism.

When the congregations declare a teaching as unsafe, we must not conclude that this teaching is erroneous or false, etc., but simply that it is not safe, and we dare not hold it further.¹⁹

In practice, however, the syllabus and the encyclical are infallible documents like the Bull Unigenitus against Jansenism.

What then do the two amount to? They will prove big sticks to be used *tempore opportune*, e. g., as in Dr. Hanna's case.

There was a day when the great universities of Oxford, Paris, or Bologna would hear the modernist. A day there was also when a synod of bishops would assemble, as they did, to see Bernard of Clarvaux and Abelard face each other at Sens. Again, in former, ages, the modernist might go under a safe-conduct to a council as did John Huss to Constance. Today, however, all that is ancient history. Now the modernist can appeal only to the university of ideas. Both Loisy and Tyrrell, the two, although unnamed, most bitterly attacked, have so appealed. In touching tones, Loisy speaks of two persecutions; Tyrrell declared that he was hung in mid-air. Others like Murri, Hébert, Houtin also have laid their views before mankind. *Securus judicat orbis terrarum*.

¹⁹ *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi*, Rome, 1903, p. 444, quoted in German in *Indexbewegung und Kulturgesellschaft*, p. 115, Passau, 1908.